OWEN ROE O'NIAL

TO

THE MEN OF IRELAND.

LETTER FIRST.

IF ever there was a moment of time big with the very fate of any nation, the preſent is that moment to Ireland. If ever there was a moment when, to interpoſe with the energy of ſoul and body, became every individual of the ſtate, who has an underſtanding to perceive, an heart to feel, and an arm obedient to his will, the preſent is that moment to Ireland. Not preſuming then upon my own wiſdom, but thinking it [illegible] to offer my private opinion, and, in the name of the nation, to call upon others to give theirs, in [illegible] of ſupport, I take up the pen with the feelings of a freeman, nor ſhall I [illegible] lay it down, till the object appears to me either gained or unattainable; till I ſee freedom [illegible] or [illegible] [illegible] will be not only unavailing to the [illegible] [illegible] to its [illegible] [illegible]

pineſs,—*the liberty of the preſs*, that cenſurate of the people, *yet remains unviolated, for Juries yet are judges.* In their breaſts lies that conſtruction of malice which conſtitutes the illegality, as it does the guilt of words or of actions. We have the whole field of inquiry before us, and we may queſtion the propriety of tolerating the *exiſtence* of thoſe powers, whoſe bare extent to queſtion was once, I may ſay, admitted a blaſphemy. The Magiſtrate is now beginning to be ſenſible, that the actions alone of men are his proper object, for they are unequivocal, objects of ſenſe, and may be reſtrained or puniſhed by the laws; but that opinions ſcorn his coercion, and, even where their tendency is dangerous, come not under his cognizance, till the action follows the opinion, and the law is *actually* infringed. He has beſides learned from experience, that to puniſh the propagator of an opinion, is indirectly to own its truth, and its likelihood to make converts. Should, for inſtance, ſome viſionary ſay to the world, that a great King imperial, born of an illuſtrious race, a race invited to the glorious taſk of confirming and eſtabliſhing liberty in a country that more than once had riſqued its all for the obtaining of it, ſhould he aſſert that he underſtood better the conſtruction of a fly-trap than the law of nature and nations; that he had more the obſtinacy of a mule than the perſeverance of a man; more of the low miſchievous cunning of a natural, than of the aſpiring aim, the ſteady dignified wiſdom of a philoſopher; more of the inſatiable rapaciouſneſs and ſullenneſs of a tyrant, than the enlarged and well directed zeal, the glowing benevolence of a patriot King:—If, I ſay, ſome viſionary, or ſome hireling ſcribler, ſhould tell us that ſuch a creature *exiſted*, and bore the name of King, would a ſenſible loyaliſt be in wrath with the pretended portrait, or could the miniſter but ſmile? It is not in nature! would exclaim the former: The latter would calmly reply, *we know* it to be falſe.

It

If then, my countrymen, I am abſurd; contempt both from you and the miniſter will be my portion and my puniſhment. If what I offer be reaſon, it cannot be a libel. If, galled by the ſeverity of truth, the miniſter would liſten to the ſuggeſtions of an imprudent revenge, the ſound of his firſt ſtep will be a *watchword*. Ye are MEN! I will not inſult you by inſtruction.

There is a timidity in politics, as in every other art or ſcience, which, like timidity in common life, ſtifles in conception all grandeur of deſign, robs reſolution of its hue, enterprize of its pith, and muſt end in inaction, if not ignominy and remorſe.

He who ſets himſelf down, and weighs every poſſible accident that may thwart his deſign, and where much good is promiſed, allows himſelf to be terrified at every appearance of evil, ſuch a man may live harmleſs in a ſolitude, but he has not virtue for ſociety. Let him retire to a cell! he was not made for action,—he may be ſainted by ſuperſtition, but a ſpirited reformer will expunge him from his calender.

There is no occaſion in which this timidity will be more evident than in times big with event, or on the eve of revolutions. It is in ſuch caſes often amiable, I was going to ſay reſpectable. It then behoves every man to weigh deeply before he decides. It behoves him to conſult the ſenſibility of his heart-ſtrings, before he takes a ſtep that may rend the tendereſt of them aſunder. It behoves him to conſider well the value of his object, and to compare the probability of attaining it with the danger of the experiment. A thouſand things it behoves him to conſider, and long, very long, muſt he be toiled in painful uncertainty, before even firmneſs can take courage, or deciſion can decide.

Let us then pauſe, weigh, and conſider our ſituation, as well in ourſelves as with reſpect to others.

Let

Let us conſider *the criſis*. But when we have weighed and conſidered, the goal is before us: our part is firmneſs.

That the ſituation of Ireland is capable of improvement, that it is not exactly ſuch as the warm imagination, the benevolent enthuſiaſm of a *Plato*, a *More*, or a *Monteſquieu*, would have formed in his dreams of perfection and happineſs, we have not a bankrupt trader, a half naked peaſant, or a ſtarving manufacturer would have the courage to aſſert. We have however reaſon to be ſatisfied with our bankruptcy, our nakedneſs, and our famine, ſince *Mancheſter* aud *Glaſgow* are ſatiafied with them, ſince the *Lords of England* are *content*, and the Commons have joined in declaring them *conſtitutional* and *rightful*. But they have not yet denied us the liberty of *thinking*. I propoſe then to enquire, as a matter of mere philoſophic curioſity; firſt,——Whether in the preſent poſture of affairs, it is probable that Ireland might recover her Independence? and ſecondly,—Is independence worth contending for?

It may ſeem odd, that I do not firſt conſider the value of the object before I am at the trouble of enquiring into the probability of attaining it. But, beſides that there are fewer perſons with whom the latter can be a matter of doubt, it would be of little importance to enquire whether a certain change would be advantageous, if the improbability of effecting it almoſt amounts to *the impoſſible*. Were I to inſtitute an enquiry, whether it would be uſeful to man to have power over the elements, I believe I ſhould be able to find few fellow adventurers in the ſpeculation. But if I begin by enquiring if ſuch power could poſſibly and eaſily be obtained, the very novelty of the ſubject might perhaps procure me a hearing.

Before I enter upon theſe queſtions, I muſt beg leave to premiſe, by way of lemma, or introductory argument,

argument, a principle upon which I intend to build much, and which I ſhall therefore beg leave particularly and minutely to diſcuſs.

The principle is this,——that political bodies, whether ſole or aggregate, whether compoſed of one perſon or a multitude, act uniformly from the narroweſt kind of ſelfiſhneſs, and are totally incapable of a ſteady or uniform principle of generoſity. The obſervation may be farther extended to individuals, (though no body politic) who from their ſituation have been under the neceſſity of acting more from political than moral motives. Morality is felt. Politics muſt be ſtudied. The conſcience of the man is natural. That of the politician artificial. The habit of reaſoning only, is not favourable to feeling. The habit of being cunning is not favourable to ſtrictneſs of principle. In general then we cannot expect politicians to be either generous or juſt. To ſee how collective bodies will be moſt likely to act towards each other, but little pains are neceſſary. All perſons are ſufficiently ſelfiſh, but few are in any degree generous. The affections of moſt people are as domeſtic as their charity, ſo celebrated by Swift. "They ſcarce ever travel abroad." They end where they ſhould begin—*at home*. Some however can feel for the little community to which they belong. A few for their country. But how many are they who are born for the univerſe? Shuffle theſe men into communities, and then will it be aſked, if communities can be ſuppoſed capable of generoſity? Can the majority be ſuppoſed either generous or juſt? Take the matter as between an individual of one nation, and the body of another nation, can it be ſuppoſed that the few attachments which he can have with a few of that other nation, to the majority of whom he muſt be at beſt very indifferent, will overcome the force of ſelfiſhneſs, and that he will divide his favours among a million, becauſe he has a friendſhip for one? Even the generous

nefous are not diſpleaſed with gratitude, but here the obligation is ſcarce felt by an individual of the obliged, and the merit is loſt in the number of obligers. There will be few favours, and gratitude will ſcarce exiſt.—But will this individual be as little likely to injure as to ſerve a nation? I cannot think ſo. Selfiſhneſs is eternally in arms, while benevolence often ſleeps on her poſt. In a thouſand acts of injuſtice the individual will be ſheltered and even applauded by the multitude of his aſſociates. Fear of diſgrace, which alone perhaps keeps him honeſt in private life, will make him diſhoneſt in public. A palpable injuſtice will be lawful policy. Political villainy will be love to his country. The honeſt man will often give up his private conſcience to his ſenſe of duty to the ſtate. The ſame ſacrifice will be pretended to by the villain. If ſuch will be the probable line of conduct which an individual of one nation or community will obſerve towards another nation, what muſt one nation expect from another? "Are not the chances, nay the certainties, of coldneſs, unſteadineſs, injuſtice, and inhumanity, encreaſed almoſt to infinity?" The unlearned in arithmetic would be aſtoniſhed at the amount of the combination. The ſteps of nations have been ever planted in ſelfiſhneſs, marked with injuſtice, and may be traced in blood. Their monuments are deſolation. Their glory is the ſtain of humanity—Let us compare facts with reaſoning. They will confirm it to a miracle!—"And firſt as to individuals, who have been politicians by neceſſity or choice."—Moſt Catholic Kings have they not been the encouragers of hereſy? Has never Preſbyter ruled with the pride of a ſelf-created biſhop? Did never reformer pull down the ſpiritual crown of the pope, that he himſelf might wear it as part of his own, or enjoy its power under lank hair or a night cap?—God's vicegerents upon earth have fomented rebellion againſt princes. Deſpots (thoſe ſteady friends to the peace,

good

good order, and ſubordination of ſociety!) have in the dominions of others ſown the ſeeds of anarchy; or, what ſeems much more unnatural, thoſe whoſe mean ambition rendered them enemies to equality, and who could have wiſhed freedom had but one neck, if they had held the ſword, theſe men have planted, foſtered, and protected Republicaniſm. Can *Grattan* himſelf even in the generous ardour of his zeal and the fire of his conſuming indignation, can he reſtrain a tear for the weakneſs of humanity, when he relates what I am obliged to add, that he whom no allurements could ſhake, no dangers could diſmay, who brightened by difficulties and gained luſtre from defeats, who refuſed the proffered ſovereignty of his country, and treated with contempt the ſupport and friendſhip of her enemies, who, rather than ſee her ruin, could have embraced with a great deſpair "Death—in the laſt ditch of his country,"—that he, even he of *ever glorious memory*, in anſwer to the petitions of his new ſubjects, *whom policy made it neceſſary to cultivate*, could declare with the cold blood of an aſſaſſin, his deliberate intention of *ruining* the Iriſh woollen manufacture, that the Engliſh might *profit* by it? could declare, in effect, that he would wreſt the morſel from the mouth of *famine*, to give another provocation to the ſated appetite of *gluttony*? Can you believe this, my countrymen!—It is a fact, if there be truth in hiſtory, if the records of England be not all as falſe as ſome of them are diſgraceful!——But heroes have been men; there have been individual villains in all ages. Nations will afford us a more amiable proſpect. They cannot, as one man have conſpired the ruin of virtue and liberty! they cannot have been ſo corrupt as to bid defiance to ſhame! They cannot have been ſo fooliſh as to ſhow an example of tyranny, that might one day be turned upon themſelves!—

I grant there is a difference between nations and individuals. The difference is great. *Individuals* have been often and uniformly generous; *nations never*. Their uniform principle is policy, either real or ſuppoſed. Unleſs this is underſtood, their conduct will appear a chaos of inconſiſtency. But what will ſeem extraordinary is, that thoſe nations who enjoyed moſt liberty themſelves have been ever the greateſt tyrants of others, and the provinces of a deſpotic King have generally been treated more kindly than thoſe of free ſtates [Hume]. The reaſon is, that in a free ſtate, every man is in a degree one of the *government*, and few men in power like to part with it. Moſt are willing to abuſe it. The proud cannot bear ſpirit in others, and there are more men of pride than of dignity. To a deſpotic King, all his ſubjects are pretty equal, provided they pay him his taxes; and if his government is rather mild, the provinces will ſhare it. The free citizen of a free ſtate will hardly put *his* ſubjects in the province on a footing with himſelf, their Lord and Governor in his capital. Common intereſt, and even common calamity, unites the provinces ſubject to deſpotiſm. They have but one maſter to ſatisfy or guard againſt—oppoſition of intereſts diſunites the Lords of a free ſtate from their ſubjects in the province. Theſe have as many maſters as there are men in the ſuperior ſtate, and each would be ſatisfied, every individual would ſhare in the mockery of fancied Majeſty. Every individual would enjoy *his* revenues and *his* taxes: every individual would propoſe *his* laws and *his* reſtraints—and all reſtraints would be ſalutary. The cry of every individual is *unconditional ſubmiſſion!* and the ſubject nation has no hope but in the impotence or ſubjection of its maſters.

But to facts—Athens the brave, the civilized, the polite, the lettered and the wiſe, ſhe who defended the liberties of Greece at Marathon and Salamis,

lamis, how long was ſhe the tyrant of Sicily, and how cruel was her tyranny!

The world has ſeen thoſe who for their own country deſpiſed death and were ſuppliants for torture, [Regulus] who in their own city "could brook the infernal devil as eaſily as a King." even thoſe has the world ſeen impoſe upon other nations a multitude of tyrants, each of them more inſolent, more inhuman than a ſingle one.

England ſat by a tame unconcerned ſpectator while Corſica was ſold by a republic and deluged with blood by a monarchy. That ſame monarchy is now protecting the revolted colonies of England, whoſe tyranny forced them into a republic. She is protecting a republic the very contraſt of herſelf in manners, opinions, religion, prejudices, and ſpirit, while thoſe who took from a king [Alfred] their boaſt, that "they were free as their own thoughts, and who have ſacrificed kings themſelves at the altar of freedom; they have driven Indians from their own woods, through zeal for civilization, chriſtianity, and juſtice, have carried others into captivity,—becauſe their complexions darkened under a fiercer ſun, and are now carrying fire, ſword, and ſcalping-knife into the country of their brethren, becauſe they thought the leading-ſtrings of an infant an incumbrance to a man; becauſe they could not be grateful to them for the retailed gifts of nature, be in love with poverty, and in raptures with ſlavery.

If honeſty, an inbred ſteady principle of honeſty, were to be expected from any nation, it might ſurely be looked for in one that was ignorant of the uſe of money; in a nation, three hundred of whoſe citizens, headed by a King, devoted themſelves for their country, and repulſed the millions of Xerxes; in a nation where all the weakneſs of the woman and the mother fled at the name of traitor, [the mother of Pauſanias] and he was no longer a ſon who was no longer a citizen. Yet the *Spartans* have had their

 Helens,

Heaven, and its Eagle HAVE THEIR PREY! Were the blood-hounds or the barbed arrows of the Spaniards more fatal or more keen to the body, than are the maxims of the Briton to the mind? Boys hunted the [illegible]; THE IRISH ARE THE SPORT OF FOOLS!

OWEN ROE O'NIAL.

LETTER SECOND.

Suæ quiſque faber fortunæ eſt, is one of thoſe truths which the experience of ages has handed down as a proverb.

What is true of *every* individual muſt be ſo of nations—"Their fortune muſt depend upon THEMSELVES."

It is a truth well worthy the deep conſideration of Ireland——I have, in my former letter, endeavoured to convince her by reaſoning, and an appeal to hiſtorical facts, of what ſhe ſhould long ere this have learned from experience; that whatever juſtice or generoſity exiſts among individuals, it is vain to look for it in the mutual intercourſe of nations. Their principle is policy.

It is time for *Ireland* to take thought for herſelf.

"That Ireland hath been, and is, ſubordinate to, and dependent on the imperial crown of Great Britain, and that the King's Majeſty, with the conſent of the Lords and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament, hath *power* to make laws to bind the people of Ireland*," is a truth too melancholy to admit contradiction. That it of right "*ought*" to be ſo, was reſerved for the modeſty and good ſenſe of an En-

* 6 Geo. I. ch. 5.

gliſh

Iriſh parliament to aſſert, and would therefore be a ſhame in Iriſhmen to deny.

That no nation can by conqueſt, or by any other means, acquire a right of perpetual dominion over another; that no conſent or compact, however expreſs or ſolemn, can bind poſterity to their injury; that no preſcription or length of time can ſanctify oppreſſion; that the difference [illegible] to [illegible] impoſed by the oppreſſors upon the act of [illegible] rights unalienable in their nature, and only overborne by force, or overlooked by folly; theſe are propoſitions which I ſhall not attempt to enlarge upon. Time, with moſt minds, gives a ſanction to error: enquiry then bears the name of impiety: but the idols of one age are trampled under foot in another, and the prejudices which once required a *Locke* to remove, are in theſe days [illegible] in the ſchools.

I ſhall not then war with the dead; nor ſhall I offend the delicacy of an *Engliſh* judge, by queſtioning the propriety, or diſputing the authority of an *Engliſh* act of Parliament. That would be "to oppoſe my private *Iriſh* judgment to public *Engliſh* authority*." And, in ſo plain a caſe, the oppoſition "muſt be virulent and factious†." *Authority* muſt be ever in the right! The demand of MAGNA CHARTA was but a ſucceſsful rebellion; the Reformation was an impious *defection* from the church; and the author of chriſtianity was an heretic and a traitor! Ireland then, by *right*, ought to be, nay more, for ever ſhall be, ſubordinate to the ſovereign legiſlative Parliament of Great Britain. I acknowledge it! my reaſon is a feeble one; ſhe thinks ſo herſelf; and who doubts the competency of her judgment? She finds herſelf formed by nature an humble attendant upon England. She troubles un-

* 6 George I. ch. 5.

† See Blackſtone's Comment. book 1, p. 90, [illegible] edition.

der

der what ſhe calls neceſſity. Her loyalty dares not form a wiſh for the preſervation of her crown in the houſe of Hanover, united with the ſeparate independency of her own legiſlature; becauſe, ſhe looks upon that with [illegible]. The very thought, *to her ſeems madneſs!* the attempt, *ſhe apprehends*, would be ruin!

I owe a deference to the general opinion, and ſhall ſubmit to it; yet as all ſound judgment on this queſtion, can only be built upon experience, it ſeems not unreaſonable to enquire, were it but as matter of ſpeculation, into the fate of other countries, which having been nearly in the ſame ſituation with Ireland, endeavoured to mend their condition. One advantage will certainly reſult from the enquiry, which cannot fail of proving acceptable to a people, who have hitherto appeared more delighted with their fears, than with any other feelings of the human heart. It will lead us, by the conſideration of our *ſuperior* reſources, to eſtimate *infallibly* the quantum of national puniſhment, likely to be ſuperadded to our preſent burdens, by our *maſters*, the Parliament of Great Britain, for the efforts of this day, when their leiſure and ſecurity ſhall permit them to turn their thoughts to us.—In proportion to our ſuperior power of reſiſting, will the means be of preventing, in future, the poſſibility of the operation of ſuch a reſiſtance.

A late reſpectable writer (*[illegible]*) has already enumerated the natural advantages of Ireland. It appears that ſhe poſſeſſes within herſelf, or immediately within her reach, almoſt every advantage that nature or ſituation can give, or that is neceſſary to make a nation rich, great, and happy.

A climate of the fineſt temperature, a ſoil of moſt extraordinary fertility; mines that encouragement might convert into ſources of national induſtry and national ſuperiority; ſeas that teem with fiſh; harbours numerous, ſafe, commodious, and well ſituat-

ed

ed for commerce; and, to conclude, a people with capacity for every thing, and who want but *time* to acquire habits of induſtry as perſevering as ſpirited.

Theſe are the *natural* advantages of Ireland. How few nations can boaſt ſo many and ſo great? Compare her rank and conſequence in the world, with what theſe advantages might entitle her to.—Enquire then whence ariſes the difference, and thank England, if you can, for the generoſity of her protection!

Are either the United Provinces, or Switzerland, to be compared to Ireland in natural advantages? I cannot think they are. The former is but one-third, the latter only one half her ſize. Ireland is an iſland, and ſuch an one as I have deſcribed; rich in climate, ſoil, mines, and harbours. Switzerland is in the heart of the Continent, and is poor in all theſe;—the latter ſhe cannot poſſeſs at all.—The Dutch States are joined to the Continent; their ſhore is dangerous from its flats; does not afford them a ſingle good harbour; and the froſt binds up their commerce during a conſiderable part of the winter. I need not mention the fiſh which the lakes of Switzerland afford. The fiſheries of Holland lie upon our coaſt. —They enjoy more from their unwearied induſtry, than we from nature and the protection of England. The Dutch have no mines. The Swiſs don't work their's, except for their neceſſary inſtruments of war and agriculture. Neither Holland nor Switzerland produce corn for half their inhabitants. In the latter half the harveſt produced by a ſtubborn ſoil is often deſtroyed by ſtorms, and but part of the remainder is allowed by the climate to ripen.

The Swiſs may be ſaid to have neither commerce nor navigation, ſince the latter they have only on their lakes, the former is confined chiefly to neceſſaries.

Of the timber of the Swiſs I need not ſpeak. They [illegible]
Holland, the ſpongy produce of her [illegible]

leſs

leſs in trade or navigation. Her navy muſt be purchaſed by induſtry. Ireland may be as induſtrious as Holland, but ſhe requires it leſs. She may raiſe a navy at home, if ſhe cannot with more advantage bring materials from abroad. The climate of Switzerland may raiſe an hardy race of ſoldiers or huſbandmen, but to a nation that would aim at more than a penurious exiſtence, it cannot be a ſubject of envy. The climate of Holland, marſhy in its ſoil, and interſected by ſo many ſtagnated canals, is not wholeſome. Some of their towns are formed on the ſoil left by the ſtagnation of rivers. In others the ſolid foundations of the earth ſeemed to have forſaken them, and they laid new ones. The ſea threatens to overwhelm them. They oppoſe it with mounds, which require a continual repair, and dream not of danger, though the failure of a bank would give them a ſecond deluge.

Labour and induſtry are in Holland neceſſary.— They cannot otherwiſe exiſt. This, it is true, will keep them laborious and induſtrious. But what they are from neceſſity, other nations may be from nobler motives, and Ireland ſets out from a point which in Holland it required the labour and induſtry of years to gain.

Holland muſt be a drudge, as ſhe ſubſiſts on the wants of other nations, and theſe, we know, are moſtly artificial. She is their factor and carrier. She may ſuffer from their caprice, ſhe muſt languiſh in their ill-humour. Their induſtry, or even frugality, would ſtarve her. Ireland is more independent. She can ſubſiſt by her internal reſources, though the world ſhould refuſe her either commerce or employment. She is rich in herſelf. Nature that made her an iſland, and gave her fertility, qualified her equally for abſolute independence, and unlimited commerce with other nations. She can ſubſiſt without other nations. She can trade with them to mutual advantage.

Such

Such are the natural advantages of Holland and Switzerland, and ſuch are they compared with Ireland. America I ſhall briefly conſider hereafter. Each of the former is ſurrounded by powerful empires. Each of them was once oppreſſed by all the rigours of ſlavery. Each of them burſt her ſhackles, and baffled the moſt inveterate attacks of enemies whoſe power ſeemed to approach them with the irreſiſtability of fate.

Holland, inferior to Ireland in every natural advantage, and equal to but a third of her in ſize, threw off the yoke of the moſt powerful Monarch then in Europe.—The firmneſs and courage which ſhe diſplayed, will appear incredible to thoſe who are un-acquainted with the power of enthuſiaſm. The ſeven provinces we are ſpeaking of ſurmounted every difficulty—they thought they could defend themſelves. The ten other provinces, ſays Voltaire, would have a *foreign Prince* to *protect* them, and are in ſlavery to this day.

One Prince [Henry the IVth of France] to whom they applied for aſſiſtance, was himſelf engaged in civil wars, and yet totter'd on his throne. The extreme caution of another, [Queen Elizabeth] in foreign enterprize correſponded but ill with her magnanimity and reſolution in domeſtic affairs; and from the reprimands ſhe was daily giving to her Houſe of Commons, for preſuming to judge of the duty they were called to, ſhe ſeemed little likely to tempt the wrath of a powerful tyrant or turn abettor of rebellion. The ſuccours received by the States were accordingly for a long time feeble and clandeſtine. To obtain open aſſiſtance from Elizabeth required a longer ſtruggle; and even the offer of their ſovereignty. But before any aſſiſtance had been received by the States, they had gotten poſſeſſion of what Doctor Johnſon calls "the choice of evil."—Their darling object liberty. The very women had formed regiments

for

for the defence of their cities; and, rather than again fall under the hated tyranny of Spain, the dykes and ſluices had been opened, and the very Peaſants, ſays Hume, had been active in ruining their own fields by an inundation.—They preferred the mercy of the waters to that of tyrants.

"Theſe ſame people have ſince withſtood the moſt formidable attacks of a Monarch who thought his power equal to univerſal empire. They have ſupported themſelves with more than equal honour againſt the combined fleets of France and England. They have ſwept the channel of England, and their inſults in the Thames have carried conſternation to the capital.

"In little more than half a century from the time, at which, unprepared as they muſt have been, they firſt ventured to take up arms againſt Spain in defence of their liberty, they beat one of her formidable Armadas *. They obliged it to take ſhelter in the Downs under the Engliſh flag. They retire—for a reinforcement;—they reſolve—that the fleet of England ſhall no longer protect their enemy; they return to the charge; and the Spaniſh navy in its flight received from them a blow which at this day, after near a century and an half, it has not fully recovered.—A few years more, *aſſiſted by a few more defeats*, ſoftened the obſtinacy of Spain. She acknowledged the independence of the States †, and in twenty years after they protected her provinces againſt France. ‡

The Swiſs, now that they are free, are more ſecure from attacks, than when they were dependant. They are defended by their mountains and the barrenneſs of their country, by their poverty, by their valour, and by the mutual jealouſies of the

* The Duke of Alva left the Low Countries in the year 1574.—They beat the Spaniſh Armada in 1639.

† Treaty of Munſter, 1648. ‡ Triple alliance in 1668.

neighbouring

neighbouring empires. A partition is not eaſily agreed upon, and none will conſent to their becoming an acceſſion to the power of another, if ſuch an acceſſion were practicable. But it muſt be confeſſed that of all the advantages I have mentioned, their valour alone, at the time they threw off the yoke, ſeemed moſt in their favour.—The enemy had poſſeſſion of their country. The balance of power was then leſs underſtood, or leſs attended to, and their poverty and commercial inſignificance muſt have been feeble inducements to the protection of their neighbours. Accordingly they had to work out their own liberty, and above three centuries elapſed before the Houſe of Auſtria acknowledged their independance *.

I believe there are few will deny that America has already eſtabliſhed her independance. She would not come over and proſtrate herſelf at the feet of England, ſo England, with the magnanimity of a conqueror, appointed ambaſſadors to her by act of Parliament. Upon England's condeſcending "to treat with armed rebels," they refuſed to treat with England. They had procured *friends*, and they preferred them to *maſters*.—For the ſituation of America in the beginning of the conteſt, hear her own unexaggerated deſcription. "Without arms, ammunition, diſcipline, revenue, government, or ally, almoſt totally ſtript of commerce, and in the weakneſs of youth, as it were, "with a ſtaff and a ſling only," ſhe dared, "in the name of the Lord of Hoſts," to engage a gigantic adverſary, prepared

* They took up arms in the year 1308.—Their independance was acknowledged in 1648, by the treaty of Munſter, the ſame by which Spain acknowledged the independance of the United Provinces.

It would be ſingular enough if the ſame period which eſtabliſhes American independance, ſhall be found to have deſtroyed the uſurpation of the British Parliament over the legiſlative rights of Ireland.

at all points, boaſting of his ſtrength, and of whom even mighty warriors were greatly afraid."

When to this enumeration of difficulties, which, one is tempted to think, requires little addition, we ſubjoin the following; that theſe colonies were not more diſunited by diſtance of place, than by difference of opinion, manners, ſpirit, religion and government; that they were ſo diſunited in all theſe, that it ſeemed the dream of a dotard to think of connecting them in one intereſt, or of bringing them to co-operate, if they could be convinced that their intereſt was the ſame; that they were expoſed to the navy and arms of England on their ſea-coaſts, to the incurſions of Indians (perhaps too juſtly enraged) on their rear, and, in ſome provinces, to the more dangerous inſurrections of their domeſtic ſlaves, whoſe diſpoſitions to revenge muſt have been expected to burſt on their more immediate oppreſſors; when all theſe particulars, I ſay, are conſidered, beſides thoſe which America herſelf has enumerated, I think ſcarce any nation on the earth ſhould abſolutely deſpair.

Let us conſider the preſent ſituation of Ireland.—I need ſcarce ſay that there is not a maritime power in Europe to which her alliance would not, in itſelf, be an object of emulation. What then would it appear to the enemies of England?—If Ireland ſhould aſk their protection, would they require to be ſounded at a diſtance, or to be aſſailed by preparatory arguments and leading propoſitions? Would they think it *prudent* to act as they did by America, to ſtand by, cool ſpectators of our ſtruggle, till they judged how far we ſhould be able to perſevere or be likely to ſucceed? or, if they determined to aſſiſt Ireland, would they be obliged to have recourſe to art in order to deceive a credulous miniſter, and to maſk their intentions until they could declare them with ſafety? No, my countrymen: Diſtant propoſitions, preparatory arguments, negociation, art,—all theſe

are

are to us unneceſſary! Conviction has long been confirmed. Their reſolution is already taken. Their arms are already in their hands. They have croſſed the Atlantic for their own intereſt and for the humiliation of England. Will a few leagues terrify them when their ſcheme is ſo near arriving at almoſt unhoped-for perfection? They were then at peace, yet they engaged in war. They are now at war, will they not *carry it on?* The ſole queſtion with them at preſent muſt be this; Will they *chuſe* to viſit us as enemies, or as friends? For viſit us they probably will.—Will they attempt a conqueſt to which they are probably unequal; or will they chuſe the eaſier road, and offer an *alliance*, which will have every real advantage to be expected from *dominion*, without the danger of an unſucceſsful attempt, or the inconveniencies and hazards of the moſt ſucceſsful execution? Will they not offer an alliance ſuch as their good ſenſe has been content with from America, and which they have thought worthy of ſupporting by a war with England? ſuch an alliance as, from its liberality, it will be the intereſt of the other European powers, at leaſt, by a tacit acquieſcence, to ſupport? An alliance that will not contribute more to the weakening of an haughty adverſary and the diſappointment of an inſatiable monopoliſt than to their own regal power, aggrandiſement and glory.

And here, my countrymen, occurs an awful pauſe! What inducements hath Britiſh policy ſuffered to take root in the hearts of Iriſhmen, to enable them to reſiſt ſuch neceſſary and proffered protection. None, my friends! Loyalty, the faireſt flower that can ornament the boſom of a Prince, finds in Ireland is happieſt ſoil.—Perſonal attachment to the King of Ireland, and his illuſtrious houſe, is the cord which binds us to our burden, and furniſhes to a Britiſh people the occaſion of loading us without bounds or mercy. Had we as little attach-

ment

ment to the Houſe of Hanover as Scotland, or Mancheſter, we had long ſince in deſpair implored the protection of other powers, for ſo long as the "Parliament of Great Britain can bind us in all caſes whatſoever," the worſt that could happen to us would be to change our maſters*. The word is not my own. It is by an Engliſh Judge and commentator directly applied to the ſituation of this kingdom and its ſubordination to England by right of conqueſt.

But has England learned nothing from her late experience in America? Will ſhe for ever truſt to our loyalty alone, and will our King for ever leave us at the mercy of a Britiſh Parliament? As to the Engliſh people the power of God has been diſplayed to them in vain. They ſeem to have revived the age of miracles, and to have left the Egyptians at a diſtance. All that ſhould have inſpired them with awe, humility, and wiſdom, ſeems but to have darkened their underſtandings and hardened their hearts! But let it be our duty, my countrymen, to conſider the criſis and profit of it! Let us adore that

* It may be ſeen by Blackſtone, b. I. p. 100. what an Engliſh lawyer thinks the *neceſſary* conſequence of *all* dependance upon *England!* We are bound by *every law* ſhe, in *her* wiſdom or wantonneſs, *thinks proper* to preſcribe. We ſhall ſoon, I ſuppoſe, be on a footing with thoſe ſlaves of the Romans who were *bound to the glebe*, or ſoil.—England will *think proper* that we ſhould not *depart* from the ſoil, but be transferred with it by *deed, will, or indenture*. This will ſave us a multitude of diſputes about *our property*, for we ſhall then, like the Roman ſlaves, become perfect THINGS, and ceaſe to be PERSONS. The Engliſh prints will then afford entertainment to thoſe who can reliſh it. If any of us are miſſing from our *ſtalls* or *lumber-rooms*, we ſhall be *advertiſed* for, and deſcribed, as "LOST, STRAYED, STOLEN, OR MISLAID."—We ſhall be taken *damage feaſant*, (perhaps *rider* and all!) and if we happen to die of cold and hunger, in an *open pound*, it will be at the ſuit of the *owner* ——! Ireland! Ireland! Doſt thou retain one ſpark of feeling, to make the aggreſſion of thee *a crime*?

wonder

wonder-working God, who in the inſtitution of our oppreſſors has laid the foundation of our relief, and who in the miſcarriages of Britiſh tyranny beyond the Atlantic, has taught Iriſhmen the practicability of their own emancipation from the authority of an uſurping Engliſh Parliament.

But WE ARE NEARER to ENGLAND. I hear my countrymen lament it,—and often have I lamented it myſelf!—Yet, (indulge me, my countrymen, while I explain my paradox!) ON THAT VERY PROXIMITY DOES THE WEAL OF IRELAND DEPEND.

We are near to England; but we are near to *aſſiſtance* alſo. The Atlantic rolls not between us and England; but neither does it roll between us and *her* enemies. Thoſe enemies are on the way. Before the wind changes they are here. Our proximity to England is to us, in the preſent poſture of affairs, what the diſtance of America was in the beginning of the conteſt, to her. The latter was a barrier againſt Britain; the former is a bridge for her foes. In this reſpect then we are equal to *America*. We have however an advantage from our proximity, which ſhe never can derive from her diſtance. It is a PERPETUAL GUARANTEE againſt the oppreſſion of any ſelf-created protector. It is perpetual, becauſe it depends not on the policy or caprice of kings or of nations. It is fixed in the nature of things.

America might have been ruined by the treachery of France, or ſhe may yet fall by Congreſs, as England has done by a Parliament.

Let Ireland be ſubject to her own legiſlation only, and one might venture to ſay ſhe is free for ever. Her ſituation and ſize fit her for that moderate degree of ſtrength and power which is moſt likely to be permanent.

Let theſe things be weighed, and perhaps that man would not be acquitted of preſumption who would venture to point out another ſpot upon the globe, to which Ireland ſhould now wiſh to be removed.

From

From this proximity of England, I would deduce THIS TRUTH, which I wiſh to be engraven on the heart of every Iriſhman: ENGLAND *is the* ONLY *power that* CAN *either aſſiſt us as* PARTNER, *or* KEEP US AS WE ARE. And this is the important moment when our own firm conſtitutional reſiſtance will derive additional ſupport from the dread of her enemies, towards ſhaking of the ſhackles of an uſurping Engliſh people.

But, unleſs we entertain for each other a mutual and general confidence, unleſs we lay aſide all rancour of prejudice on account of diſtinctions either political or religious, to attempt ſuch a relief from thoſe ſhackles would be only to ſolicit confuſion.

There are, however, many inſtances of ſtates differing very much in religion, and yet united in ſtrict civil confederacy and union. Scarce ſix of the Cantons of Switzerland are Proteſtants, the ſeven remaining are Roman Catholicks; and, what ſeems a little extraordinary, the greater number of the Roman Catholick Cantons are democratical, that of the Proteſtant cantons ariſtocratical in their government. In the United Provinces the majority of the people are either Preſbyterians or Roman Catholicks, and tho' Preſbyterianiſm is the eſtabliſhed religion, yet the toleration or connivance which all ſects meet with from the government, has produced a general moderation and peace, and, in its natural conſequences, has added power, grandeur, and ſtability to the ſtate. The ſtate of Pennſylvania is equally various in its religion. The laws of this province are more liberal than the ſpirit of any other provinces. They give no preference to any ſect. They tolerate all ſects. All ſects are therefore not only peaceable but content. Moſt of the other ſtates of America, ſo firm in their union againſt England, are ſcarcely more oppoſite than they are inveterate in the ſeveral prejudices and opinions which they carried with them from Europe. In ſhort, from all the facts

we

we can collect, our uniform concluſion muſt be,—that that nation is moſt likely to be great, powerful, and happy, which finds political and civil moderation neceſſary to its very *being*. Where there are no ſects or parties, I may venture to ſay there cannot be ſenſe, ſcience, liberty, or commerce. Where, from circumſtances internal or external, different ſects are nearly ballanced in power, the laws muſt be moderate, and the ſpirit of the laws will become the ſpirit of the people. The nation will be in harmony within itſelf, and that moderation and good ſenſe which will diſtinguiſh it in its internal government and policy, muſt characteriſe it in its conduct towards other nations.

It is very ſenſibly obſerved by a Roman Catholic Prieſt *, in a late Addreſs to thoſe of his own perſuaſion in Ireland, that "conquerors, (and, let me add, traders and politicians) are of no religion." The Engliſh eſtabliſhed popery in Canada. The French entered into alliance with Preſbyterians in North America, and, I dare ſay, would have done the ſame if their Deity had been the ſun or a ſerpent, an onion or a monkey. The Dutch, it is ſaid, tread upon the croſs at Japan, and the Engliſh make alliances with Moors and with Indians.

The French are, perhaps, even in religion, as liberal a nation as any in Europe. I judge not of them by their creeds, confeſſions, or articles of belief: God forbid that I ſhould judge by theſe alone of the hearts or underſtandings of any people upon earth, who have public creeds, confeſſions, or articles! Theſe are not always formed by the wiſeſt or moſt religious people of a nation. The wiſeſt and moſt religious are generally better employed. I judge of the French nation by the general conduct of the people: and I believe it will be owned that they are more liberal to Engliſhmen, than Engliſhmen are

* The Rev. Arthur O'Leary.

to them. The abſurdity of ſuppoſing that even conquerors would make violent alterations in private property, and involve themſelves in the perplexed diſputes and antiquated claims of families, that have ſuffered by forfeiture, has been well expoſed by the Reverend Divine juſt mentioned. Were the queſtion indeed between two pretenders to the crown, the caſe might be different. He who ſucceeded muſt reward ſome of his adherents, and gratify others. This muſt be done at the expence of the oppoſite party. But a conqueror, who is not able to cruſh the ſubdued nation at a ſingle effort, will think himſelf happy in prevailing upon the people to remain quiet as he found them. He will make no alteration which he can avoid; he will avoid every alteration which can diſguſt or diſpleaſe. What then is to be expected from even a powerful protector, that offers independence to a nation ſo divided into parties that no one of them has power to cruſh the others, ſupported as they would be, by the nation that formerly enſlaved them? I ſay that, in this caſe, we might expect ſuch a moderation as would overrule every petty diſtinction or jealouſy, and would unite the nation by COMMUNITY OF INTEREST. To make an alteration in the eſtabliſhed religion, or to deny to all denominations of Proteſtant Diſſenters that toleration which they at preſent enjoy, would be the madneſs of folly. Thoſe we ſpeak of are neither fools nor madmen.

The Roman Catholics might, with juſtice indeed, expect a more complete toleration. But it would require peculiar delicacy to grant this without offending thoſe Proteſtants who at preſent enjoy but a toleration themſelves. The interference of Roman Catholic protectors, conſcious of the prudence their ſituation required, muſt be of the moſt temperate kind. The alterations made would be gentle, gradual, and rather the effect of an inſenſible alteration of opinion and removal of prejudice,

than

than an act of force or power in the ſtate.—And from the co-operation of all theſe cauſes, I am inclined to think there would naturally ariſe a mildneſs of government, and a benevolence of toleration which is unknown to the laws of any other country in Europe, and which, enthuſiaſm itſelf has ſcarce dared to think conſiſtent with the littleneſs of human nature.

But whatever may be the national dignity and ſtrength of Ireland, or whatever advantages ſhe might derive from the preſent poſture of affairs, there are ſome who cannot readily give up their attachment to the people of England, or think themſelves juſtified in deſerting them in their preſent ſtate of misfortune, while there are others who yet dread her power, and tremble at her name. To the former I ſhall ſpeak more particularly hereafter, and hope to ſhew that we are not bound by any ties of duty, gratitude, or honour, to remain in ſubjection to the parliaments of England.

At preſent I would addreſs myſelf to the latter.—That the power of England is not yet an imagination I readily will own.—Great even yet is the power of England, and great is the memory of her glory! but her glory lives but in memory; and the ſinews of her power are withered,—foiled and ſpoiled by America; whom, in the hour of her inſolence, ſhe treated with a contempt that would have robbed victory of its honour, but has covered defeat with aggravated diſgrace; returning reaſon can ſuggeſt but one conſolation for her folly,—that ſomething yet remains for madneſs to ſquander, that there is yet a remnant which penury may ſave. The arbitreſs of empires may yet exiſt among nations! the patroneſs of nations may yet be an *[illegible]*!

There was a time when the world and the *Roman Empire* were ſynonimous terms.

There was a time too when the very name of Rome kept the Provinces in awe, tho' ſhe could

ſcarce

ſcarce have defended her walls.—England has fallen by her own weight which ſhe wanted wiſdom to balance. Thoſe days are paſt in which her hiſtory went hand in hand with romance.—*France* has ſtruck terror into HER CONQUERORS, and has ſhaken the throne of HER *King*! *The Engliſh Channel* has become a term of mockery! It has ſeen the navy of England in its FLIGHT! The navy of England has left her coaſts to be inſulted! That the navy of England was able to ſecure the *protection* of a *Port* has, to a ſovereign of England, become a theme of congratulation!

While England *thus* protects *herſelf* need I aſk what protection ſhe is likely to afford to *Ireland*? If we remain by her bad policy in our preſent impoveriſhed ſtate, can ſhe protect us from the arms or inſults of her enemies?

Have we not men in arms already? Men whom England, and the ſlaves of England, would long ere this have diſarmed, had they dared to do ſo! Men whoſe ſpirit they now affect to approve, becauſe they find their approbation is indifferent to them! Men whoſe ſpirit muſt obtain a momentary protection, and to whom a very little time will render protection unneceſſary! Men who may yet teach England that the fall of their own country benumbs not their courage; that it is not on the plains of Flanders or America alone that IRISHMAN can CONQUER!

The ſubject, my countrymen, has riſen upon me. I have (I hope you will think unavoidably) been led into ſome details. My indignation, upon other occaſions, I have found it difficult to repreſs. You will conſider the deſign, and pardon any involuntary failure in the execution. But, before I take my leave for the preſent, allow me to aſk one ſhort queſtion:

Shall

Shall we truſt to other nations for a *temporary protection*, which (judging from human nature, and their particular line of conduct) I aver it to be equally their intereſt and their inclination to give, and the bounds of which, as I have endeavoured to prove, they *cannot* exceed; or, ſhall we depend to eternity on the generoſity of a nation who has ſhewn herſelf as incapable of generoſity as of juſtice, and whoſe folly has diſabled her from performing the duties of either?—She thunders forth the mandates of her OMNIPOTENCE; but, is her *providence* ſo particular, ſo watchful, ſo active, and ſo benevolent, that we ſhould leave to her more than the God of Nature demands for himſelf,—that we ſhould leave *agency* to her, and addreſs her but in *prayer*? Is the night of religious ſuperſtition paſſed away, and muſt that of political idolatry uſurp the rightful viciſſitude of day? Our night of both has been ſufficiently long? but the ſun of England, in whoſe meridian beams our feebler light was loſt, is now ſet,—perhaps, for ever: and the Heſperian ſtar of *America*, which ſet with England, for a time, is now riſen, a *Lucifer* to light us into day. It has moved, 'till it is vertical in glory, and points to OUR POLITICAL SALVATION!

OWEN ROE O'NIAL.

LETTER THIRD.

YOU have heard, my countrymen, the ſpeech of the Miniſter! You have heard it, and I hope it has ſunk deep into your hearts, and added fervour to that loyalty which is now the only cement of the empire, and which the conſiſtency of Miniſters has therefore laboured to deſtroy!

You

You muſt alſo before this have been acquainted with two political phænomena which this age has produced.—Some of our *Iriſh* common-law Judges deteſt ſo much all *Engliſh innovations**, that they will not, on a *conſtitutional* queſtion, admit a ſingle conſtruction that is *liberal*! But there is a ſecond to which the *firſt* is as nothing. A Chancellor of Ireland, an *Engliſhman*, entertains ſuch a regard to the *Laws* (in their preſent ſtate of penury) that he will not venture to judge of them by *equity and good conſcience*! Nay, where his Sovereign has been *engaged* in approving of *motions* that were unconſtitutional, he will correct the Sovereign though ſpeaking from the Throne.

Leſt, however, ſo rare an inſtance of integrity ſhould be offenſive to the *Miniſtry*, I muſt beg leave to offer for it a very ſimple apology. His Lordſhip is [illegible] the King's [illegible]. He knows the *heart* of his gracious maſter, and that, if he erred, it was [illegible] *world*!

But to return to the Speech, (from which it may be doubted if I have really digreſſed) I would wiſh, my Countrymen, that, by connecting thoſe parts of it which are accidentally thrown at the greateſt poſſible diſtance, you would collect its beginning and end, its ſum and ſpirit. For there you will ſee that *the trade and commerce of* this kingdom are objects too "great and important" for an *Iriſh* Parliament to deliberate on, till the *general* tranquillity is reſtored, and *England* can *aſſiſt* her in the deliberation, by *her Parliament and army*! But you will ſee, at the ſame time, that it would be very proper to give *ſerious* attention to the *Proteſtant Charter Schools*, [illegible] *Linen Manufacture*; the regulation of *theſe being* [illegible], and above all, [illegible] it is acknowledged, to your

* See Lord [illegible]'s deciſions.

deareſt

deareſt intereſts. But, to compenſate for this defect, they "will not *impede* your efforts"—(as an attention to "great and important objects" *might* do)—by calling down upon your heads *the injured omnipo-tence of* ENGLAND.

Such, my Countrymen, is the marrow of this elaborate and truly miniſterial production! I ſhould have paſſed it over, as I would do all productions that are intended to have as little meaning as poſſible, leſt the meaning they have ſhould be diſcovered to be a bad one. But amidſt its laboured inconſiſtency, and in the conduct of its official ſupporters, there appears ſo much of the genuine ſpirit of Engliſh tyranny, of a tyranny that relents not at our loyalty nor our poverty, and pays a *neglected* deference to our ſpirit, that I thought I could not chuſe a more proper introduction to my propoſed letter on the INDEPENDENCE of *Ireland*.

A ſenſible, and, I believe, a very honeſt Member of the Engliſh Parliament, (Sir Cecil Wray) after giving a deſcription of our manners and ſituation, concludes with telling us, that "he has little hopes of our RUIN being prevented."

A late moſt able and ſpirited writer obſerves that "the conſtitution is now reduced to a ſtate in which NO PUBLIC BENEFIT can be obtained but by the collective body of the people." If this cannot be doubted, the queſtion is only concerning the *mode* and *object* of the interpoſition.

If any public benefit can be obtained, or if our ruin can be prevented, it muſt, I think, be by one of theſe three meaſures. By a UNION with England; by ASSOCIATIONS to conſume our own manufactures, and to learn the uſe of arms; or by throwing off ALL DEPENDENCE upon the people and Parliament of England, diſclaiming all political connection with the latter but through our common Sovereign, and protecting for the future our

ſeparate

ſeperate rights as Iriſhmen and as men. Theſe ultimately reſolve themſelves into the following queſtion, "is independence worth contending for?" If any thing *ſhort* of independence will prevent our ruin, or obtain ſuch a public benefit as ſhould content the collective body of the people, to aim at independence would be either villainy or madneſs. I ſhall therefore conſider each of theſe meaſures ſeperately, and with perfect freedom. If the laws allow not ſuch freedom, they muſt be ſenſible of their own weakneſs, and *we* ſhould be equally ſo. To *tolerate* ſuch laws is to ſolicit their farther corruption. If, in Ireland, and in the opinion of Iriſhmen, it is become treaſon to *our Sovereign*, to add to his dignity by making HIS PEOPLE *free* I have loſt all idea of *loyalty*, and as I have lived a traitor, a traitor I muſt die. If it is at preſent, in Ireland, and in the opinion of Iriſhmen, a *public crime* to *think too well of one's country*, it will ſoon be ſcarcely *poſſible* to commit a crime in this country. Ireland will ſoon have neither *government* nor *men!*"

The late Mr. Hume, in one of his political eſſays, I think, has ſaid of Ireland, that "it is an enſlaved nation, the *individuals* of which are free." If the individuals of a nation are free under the government, they muſt be very unreaſonable individuals if they are not content; for the government is nothing to them but as it procures them this freedom. But I will not ſcruple to affirm that the obſervation is a *contradiction in terms*, and one of thoſe contradictions, which are but too apt to miſlead the inattentive, and to be abuſed by the deſigning. The *individuals* of Ireland compoſe the *nation* of Ireland. The nation is enſlaved—yet the *individuals* that compoſe it, are *perfectly free!*

A body is compoſed of parts or particles; *the whole* has a certain quality, (of ſlavery) yet not a *ſingle particle* of that body has a *portion* of that quality! This ſeems *mightily* philoſophic; and yet Hume was a *materialiſt!* I do not think, however, that

that he believed in an *infallible church* compoſed of *fallible individuals!*——That Ireland is enſlaved, few who know its ſituation can doubt, but to thoſe who do, the courſe of the ſubject will furniſh proofs but too inconteſtable.—Her people then, as individuals, *cannot* be free.

As to the Engliſh conſtitution itſelf, (that boaſted model of perfection and incorruptibility!) its *modern hiſtory* will, to moſt people, I believe, appear ſtricture ſufficient.—If *perfect*, it could not have been corrupted.—If it did not *admit* mal-adminiſtration, it could not have been ſo ill adminiſtered.

The prophecy of Monteſquieu is already fulfilled. —The legiſlative power of England is become *more corrupt than the executive.* Thro' that corruption the executive *commands* the legiſlative, and, in effect, they are *one*;—this is nearly the deſcription of deſpotiſm! yet I allow that even forms are ſometimes *material*—The Grand Signior may take off the head of his ſubject—"but he cannot force him to drink wine!" Could he do *every thing*, his power would be intolerable.—An Engliſh King cannot tax his ſubjects without the conſent of their Repreſentatives, who muſt at the ſame time tax *themſelves*, nor can he take away the life of a *ſingle* individual unleſs convicted by *his Peers*. But he can *induce* the Repreſentative to untie the purſe of the nation, and he may unſheath the ſword of war, which may involve the half of his ſubjects in ruin, and expoſe the other half to the invading ſword of the enemy.

When Sir William Blackſtone, [B. 1, 336] after a formidable enumeration of the *real* powers of the King, through influence, the ſtanding army, and the perpetual revenue, tells his countrymen, almoſt in ſo many words, that their *chief* dependance is on the *perſonal character* of their King, it is not entirely a compliment paid by the courtier; it is a

 truth

truth extorted from the lawyer, and which the courtier would *palliate**.

If ſuch be the government of England, what muſt we ſay of that of Ireland?—Monteſquieu doubts whether a *ſlave* be capable of a ſingle virtue. What then muſt be the virtue of a *nation* that is enſlaved? *Honour* may ſupport the individual, but the abjection of a nation is infamy indeed! When this abjection is once eſtabliſhed, a virtuous, independant and ſpirited *individual* is, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, one of the miracles of nature! Corruption in a *dependent* nation is the very malignity of corruption. In paſſing through a multitude, and through the ſervants of ſervants, inſtead of being filtered, it acquires ſucceſſive contamination.

In this kingdom the power of chuſing Repreſentatives in Parliament, the *only* public and conſtitutional exertion of liberty in which *the people* are allowed to bear a part, is, under Engliſh government, reduced to this. It is the liberty of chuſing *the man* who ſhall betray us, or act as mourners to the ceremony.—It is a gloomy picture, my countrymen, if that can be called a picture which is almoſt all a ſhade. In drawing it I have felt as variouſly as the man who retraces the character of a friend of whom the world thought meanly, becauſe misfortune, that expoſed his vices, caſt a ſhade over his virtues.—The days of *our* misfortunes,

* After the enumeration abovementioned, Sir William ſtruck, as it ſhould ſeem, by the terror of it, tells us how much, *till* half a dozen helpleſs *poſſibilities* ſhall happen, "it will be our *eſpecial duty*, as good ſubjects and *good Engliſhmen*, to *guard againſt* its influence—and, *above every thing*, to hope that we may long, very long, continue to be governed by—our *preſent Sovereign*—who, in all his *perſonal* acts, has ſhewn ſuch veneration for our free conſtitution,—and will therefore never harbour a thought—detrimental to public liberty."—Thus does *public liberty* depend upon *the virtue of a King*!

my

my countrymen, have been out-numbered by the inſults you have ſuffered!

But a change is at hand! "every man will bring you a piece of money, and every one an ear-ring of gold.—Your latter end will be more bleſſed than your beginning!"

But *how may theſe things be?* by a UNION——by ASSOCIATIONS——or by INDEPENDENCE?—— I feel the whole weight of the ſubject, and it is the conſciouſneſs that I am ſo far not unworthy of it, that urges me to undertake a queſtion under which I ſhould otherwiſe deſpair.

The author of the letter to the people of Ireland, which I lately mentioned, has on the ſubject of a union thrown into a very few pages what might furniſh an ordinary writer with matter for a volume. a few of them I ſhall repeat, ſince it is difficult to add to them. I may perhaps endeavour to illuſtrate ſome of them, and to this purpoſe I hope the obſervations juſt made, will ſomewhat contribute.—

The firſt leading and comprehenſive obſervation upon a union, one indeed that makes all others appear almoſt unneceſſary, is that by it we loſe our own legiſlative aſſembly, and take the readieſt means of deſtroying the only one that ſhall remain of the empire. Already, God knows, there is little occaſion to add to the corruption of the Britiſh Parliament! Yet what muſt we expect, if we pour into it ſuch another "uniform and potent body of corruption" as has flowed from *Scotch Repreſentatives!*

We have now ſome ſlender ties upon the fears, at leaſt, of our Parliament. We ſhould then have none. Our preſent Abſentees, "men as dependant on the Miniſter, as they are independant of the people," are not more likely to be incorruptible than the deputies of Scotland. "Upon the ruins of (what *remains* to us of) national conſequence

and publick ſentiment, we ſhould have a few individuals, inſignificant in England, ingroſſing the powers of Ireland, jobbing away her intereſt, never reſiding with her people, and, of courſe, ignorant of her condition, and unawed by her reſentment."

That no repreſentation could eſſentially ſerve *Ireland*, may be collected from this; that her number of deputies being neceſſarily ſmall in proportion to thoſe of England, even if not corrupted, they would be overpowered, in every queſtion between the two nations.——

The tyranny which England now indulges againſt Ireland, contrary to every principle of the conſtitution, ſhe would then diſplay in *apparent* conformity to it.—Even a union could not make her feel for Ireland as ſhe does for her own moſt inſignificant village.

We are by nature her rival, and, in ſome reſpects, I may even ſay, her ſuperior. Our *quota*, or proportion, of taxes muſt be *fixed*. Can any man then be ſo bigotted to the idea that *political generoſity* exiſts, and exiſts in *England*, as to ſuppoſe ſhe would encourage her rival *much* beyond what would enable her to pay that quota of taxes? But, allowing England to be generous to us, at preſent, muſt ſhe not ſoon hate us with as much cordiality and as much juſtice, as ſhe now does Scotland? The conduct of the nation and her repreſentatives would juſtify it.——Nations will not return *good for evil*, however uſual that may be with individuals;——In this ſituation, is there a noble ſcheme in agitation for the improvement of manufactures, the opening of communications between different parts of this kingdom, the convenience or extenſion of trade?—Is an inland Canal to be cut, a Colliery to be promoted, a Quay, a Mole, or Dock to be built,—is it wiſhed to improve or put in a ſtate of defence

defence any of thoſe harbours which open to the world, and have capacity to receive it?—Immediately an hoſt of petitions are oppoſed,—or the Miniſter is threatened with an inſurrection—perhaps raiſed by *himſelf*—The ſcheme drops;—or it is procured by means the moſt diſgraceful or moſt ruinous. Jobbing is ſeldom gratuitous—Compliments muſt be returned. The empire ſuffers. They ſuffer who receive juſtice as a *favour*. At any rate their ſpirit is deſtroyed, for they feel their dependance and their impotence.

When to this conſideration, ſo ſufficient in itſelf, we add a number of others and none of them inconſiderable. I think there are few who will ſee cauſe for a moment's heſitation.

Such are the incumbrances England would lay upon our infant commerce, a burthen ſuppoſed too heavy for the maturity of hers; ſuch too is the vaſt encreaſe of abſentee-intereſt in her deputies to England, and their connections: in our nobility, and all others poſſeſſed of large landed property; in the votaries of pleaſure, who now ſpend part of the year in Dublin, but would then follow the legiſlature and the deity to London; while our manufacturers muſt be ſo far unemployed, agriculture, ſo intimately connected with manufacturers, muſt ſuffer; the tenantry muſt groan under rack rents and agents. Such in conſequence of the proceeding, would be the RUIN OF DUBLIN, without any very eſſential or comparative advantage to the other parts of this kingdom, all which of would be proportionally deſerted, unemployed, or injured.—Such is the remitting of the revenues to England, with the ſupernumerary expences, making a great part of revenue; with a land-tax an entirely new one, and inſeparable from an union, and all the other indefinite and ruinous payments; ſo that Ireland would be a country conſiſting of merchants,

lawyers,

lawyers, revenue officers and penſioners, annually remitting to England the produce of [illegible] land and revenue."

We come now to conſider the effects of ASSOCIATIONS: and here, though I ſhould allow the writer ſo often quoted that all the advantages he expects, or all the nation has a right to demand, would accrue from them, if rigidly adhered to; yet I cannot help thinking that the *Aſſociations* themſelves will ſhortly melt away, unleſs they have a farther object than merely *the freedom of commerce*, or what is generally called "the *defence* of our iſland." I mean not to depreciate *Aſſociations.* They were a "meaſure of neceſſity," and they are now as neceſſary as ever. I mean not to depreciate the merit of thoſe friends to their country, whoſe generous indignation and zeal firſt convinced her of their neceſſity. If there is a ſpirit now in Ireland, and if that ſpirit is likely to continue; if Ireland is not ſunk beneath *deſpair*, it is due, under Heaven, to the ſpirit and diſtinction of thoſe who firſt rouſed her from that ſleep which ſeemed to the ſleep of death. But I ſtill muſt think that *Aſſociations* are but a *firſt ſtep* which ſhould lead to the *ſecond one*; or, to expreſs myſelf more clearly, that the objects hitherto propoſed by them being inſufficient, that is, not aiming at the root of the diſeaſe, they will not only be unequal to its cure, but perhaps occaſion a relapſe that may be inveterate or mortal.

"FREE TRADE *alone* can save us." For the opinion *England* entertains of our *ſituation*, conſult the Speech of the Miniſter. Is it not temporizing and equivocal in every ſentence? Does it not applaud and compliment, flatter and inſult us in a breath?

Look to the government of England! Look to her government over us. Look to our people ſuffering under both theſe; then tell me who can, that while theſe exiſt, our Aſſociations can be laſting.

The

The ſame radical fault in our preſent conſtitution, which rendered Aſſociations *neceſſary*, will, while it continues, *defeat* them. They will be ſapped as the conſtitution was deſtroyed. The ſame power which renders abortive all barely "internal reſolutions of individuals," will gradually undermine our "written covenants;" and I do not think a ſingle argument can be uſed to prove the neceſſity of theſe laſt, that will not demonſtrate that even *they* will not bind——*if the power of the Engliſh Parliament over this country ſhall continue.*

In all the Aſſociations there is a *condition* either expreſſed or neceſſarily implied. We aſſociate, *during the time that England ſhall continue* her unjuſt, illiberal, and impolitic reſtrictions, &c. Were it otherwiſe, we ſhould but imitate the conduct we condemn.

But *who* ſhall determine *when* England has *ceaſed* to be unjuſt, &c? *When* ſhe has taken off a *ſufficient* number of thoſe reſtrictions? *When* the people of Ireland *ought* to be content for the *preſent*, and ſhould accept her *promiſes* for the future? *Who* is to determine all theſe points? *Every individual for himſelf.* Are the ſubſcribers bound *expreſsly* to wait the deciſion and concurrence of the *majority*? I believe there is no inſtance of it, and if there were, it would be nugatory. In all voluntary Aſſociations, where there is not a *power* eſtabliſhed to *keep* men to them, (which power, though formed upon the freeſt principles, muſt, to be effectual, be in a degree arbitrary,) the Aſſociators will judge *how* far the majority itſelf, whom they bound themſelves to obey, adhere to the *primitive intention* of the Aſſociation, or what they will call *the ſpirit of the conſtitution.* This ſpirit will be what every individual conceived it to be at firſt, conceives it now to be, on maturer reflection, or *chuſes* to conceive it, for motives known to himſelf. Some may for

a while

a while be retained in the croud by indolence, by ſhame, or want of ſpirit; but when once a few break through the rules, and give their reaſons with plauſibility and boldneſs, eſpecially if the multitude feel any inconvenience from their virtue, or thoſe who draw off, gain any advantage by their ceceſſion,—*the written covenant of all* degenerates into *the internal reſolution of each individual.*—How forceable that is we have heard powerfully explained! Kings who truſted too far to an oath of allegiance, in which the condition perhaps was not expreſſed, but is, of neceſſity implied, have found that *they could do wrong*, and their ſubjects *redreſs* it. If the people take not the hint, the wrong that *is* done they may be unable to redreſs.

The two ways by which we can enforce the covenant, will, I think, ſcarcely bear a cloſe examination. We may "agree never to vote for, but ever againſt ſuch perſons as refuſe to *ſign.*" But when thoſe who ſign, *may* have plauſible reaſons for *drawing off*, and few can judge of their ſincerity; and when thoſe who are to judge are little more likely to be ſincere than the men whoſe conduct they examined, and perhaps have imitated, what becomes of "the people's balance in the (preſent) conſtitution," or where, eſpecially in the beginning of the period, is the *great* benefit of the Octennial Bill? Are we not again and again betrayed, and do we not again and again *return* our betrayers? None want *their* ſufficient reaſons for their conduct, whatever it is; nor do any want people to whom their reaſons are ſufficient. *Where the* GOVERNMENT *is corrupt,* ALL *are too much alike.*

The ſecond method of enforcing the covenant will turn out as ineffectual. "We may publiſh the name of the draper and mercer who refuſes the covenant, and perſiſts to import, and we may agree never more to deal with him." But drapers and mercers are of no country or party. The body of them

them will go with the croud, and leave the cuſtom of the *virtuous few* to the virtuous *mercer*; a cuſtom very edifying and very profitable to both parties! Suppoſe, however, what is not very probable, that we ſhall not be flattered out of our Aſſociations by ſome paltry conſideration; ſuppoſe that our Aſſociations will ſtand the ſhock of authority, and the undermining of influence. Will England grant us the *advantages* of an union unleſs we ſubmit to the *burthens*? We ſhall probably excite her obſtinacy; (for her obſtinacy *may* be excited!) cordiality between the nations will be gradually diminiſhed; our preſent government may be rendered ſtill worſe by obſtruction, no ſcheme being on foot to *improve* it; the nation, uncertain of its intereſts, and unſteady in its wiſhes, will be expoſed to its enemies at home and abroad; and it will either be ſeized into an union, attacked with advantage by foreign enemies, or driven, at a more unfavourable time, into an attempt at independence. If it appears then, that, of the only three means by which the people can interpoſe to prevent their *ruin*, a union would be almoſt in every view ineligible, and that the moſt laſting Aſſociations, while the power of the Engliſh Parliament over this country ſhall continue, will be far from affording us effectual and compleat relief; we are driven upon *independence*, as "*a meaſure of neceſſity*." The *alternative* is legiſlative INDEPENDENCE OR RUIN.

I might here, my countrymen, cloſe the argument.—It is already compleat. If we can trace all our misfortunes, the deſtruction of our liberty and the failure of every public ſcheme, to *the power of England* and our unfortunate connection with her, we muſt throw off her power and abjure her connection, before we can either be free or happy.

Still, however, a few ſcruples may remain with ſome, and to enumerate a few of the advantages of legiſlative independence will not only ſhew its own intrinſic value, but evince ſtill farther its ſuperiority

to all that can proceed from the moſt plauſible union, and all hitherto propoſed from the moſt effectual aſſociation.

I begin with the firſt and moſt comprehenſive advantage;—that, in effect, which will give riſe to every other. Inſtead of being allied, or inſeparably united to the intereſts of an old empire, tottering under a decay of nature, hurried on by her vices, we ſhould enjoy in our own renewed conſtitution all the ſoundneſs, virtue, and vigour, of youth. That worſt of all corruptions, introduced by the worſt of all tyrannies,—that of the corrupt Parliament of a ſuperior and degenerate nation,—would be removed. The intereſt of the governors and of the people, now ſo oppoſite, would be reconciled. We ſhould be our own governors, for the nation would be free to purſue her own intereſt under her ſovereign, who would be more free to indulge her. Public ſpirit would ſhake of the deſpair of centuries. Public virtue would have an object, and private virtue, the virtue of the people, would at once be the ſpring, the effect, and the cement of the government.

I have endeavoured to ſhew that our peculiar ſituation, being divided internally by difference of religion, and being equally near to *oppreſſion* and *protection*, muſt naturally produce a government of the very mildeſt form, and whoſe firſt and ruling principle muſt be *toleration*. How far this would contribute to the happineſs, greatneſs, and ſtability of the ſtate, as it would afford an aſſylum and encouragement to arts, induſtry, and virtue, let the former errors of France, the prudence and induſtry of Holland, and the great and amiable virtues of Pennſylvania, unfold and enforce unto the minds of all who have hearts to give fair play to their underſtandings!

A conſequence of our legiſlative independence, and of the youth, wiſdom, and moderation, of our government, would be our being unconcerned in the

the wars of any other nation, from which we reap much danger and loſs, but no poſſible profit, no poſſible honour; and we ſhould be neither tempted nor inclined to enter into any ourſelves.

In every unhappy neceſſity of that kind, we ſhould defend ourſelves; we ſhould be prepared to do ſo both by land and by ſea, inſtead of being left expoſed and defenceleſs by thoſe who had brought us into danger, and being *obliged* to acknowledge as a favour the *alms* of our ſuperior.

We ſhould have *a free and univerſal trade*, unchecked by the miſtaken jealouſy, or real rivalry, of England. All parts of the nation would be equally attended to by a legiſlature that had an equal intereſt in all parts, and that would be native, reſident, uncorrupted, and unfettered. It is here to be remarked, that from the very nature of trade, which is an exchange of the ſuperfluities of one nation for the wants of another, England is the laſt country on earth with whom Ireland can trade to advantage, and Ireland is the laſt country upon earth whoſe *trade alone* can be an object to England. The ſpirit of trade is a ſpirit of *equality*. It is equally inconſiſtent with a ſpirit of *monopoly* or *revenue*. Now the produce of England and Ireland is *the ſame*. There can be no trade *between* the nations that does not ariſe from the inferiority of induſtry or ſkill in *one* of them, and in trading with *other* nations they are *rivals*. The inferior nation muſt then be oppreſſed in exact proportion to her comparative advantages. Hence we may account for the freedom of Ireland under Engliſh government before trade was underſtood, and the laboured diſcouragement which her induſtry has invariably received ſince its progreſs in Europe.

Trade aſſumed a new face in Europe, from the diſcovery of the paſſage to the Eaſt Indies by the Cape of Good Hope. This happened in the reign of Henry the 7th, and in his reign, through the influence of his Viceroy, Sir Edward Poynings, Ireland

land gave up her *independence* by giving up *the propoſing* of laws, which, in every free government, belongs to *the people*. They who give up one important right will ſee others uſurped. Ireland then ſubmitted to the trammels of England, and, as might be expected, ſhe has not only worn them ever ſince, but they have been regularly and unconſtitutionally encreaſed.

The juſtice of England ended where her *intereſt* commenced. Her injuſtice will end but with her *power*.

From the independence of Ireland which will afford an object, ſcope, and field, for arts, induſtry, and genius, we ſhall not only ſecure the reſidence of our great men, who will find that reſidence both agreeable and neceſſary to their intereſt, but we ſhall acquire that *name* of which we are not barely deprived,—but which heightens the inſolence and inſults of our tyrants. England now ſhines with light borrowed from her ſatelite.

"There is a *ſpirit* in man as well as an underſtanding!" They are equally inſpired by the Almighty, and he who ſuffers his ſpirit to degenerate, as much as if he allowed his underſtanding to be corrupted, diſhonours his Creator by his disfiguring his image.

Has the Almighty ſtamped folly upon the forehead, or written *coward* upon the heart of an *Iriſhman?* Is he an aſs, that he ſhould crouch under every burden? or a ſtone, that he ſhould be inſenſible to inſult?—Are *Engliſhmen* gods, that we ſhould worſhip them? Shines there a glory round them, before which the face of an *Iriſhman* ſhould be hid?

Seldom, my countrymen, (and *never* in the ſeat of our ſlavery) have we met them upon equal terms;—but when we did, I truſt we have not been diſgraced!—Our unhappy exiles, victims to her policy, have proved that there is a day of retribution, of which the wiſeſt are not aware. They have proved

proved that thoſe may avenge their country whom their country has proſcribed, or whom the policy of its tyrants has rendered it unable to ſupport.

If they themſelves think us inferior to them as men, whence is it that they reſtrain our induſtry, by the uſurpation of their Parliament?——And whence is it that our induſtry has ſometimes overcome all reſtraints? Whence is it that they deceived us into an inequitable exchange of a manufacture in which we excelled, for one of which we were totally ignorant, and when we acquired ſuperiority in the new one, robbed us of the poor produce of that inequitable bargain?

Whence is that they thought *they* muſt ſuffer from *our* freedom, and robbed us of MAGNA CHARTA, the common gift of nature, confirmed to us by our King?—Whence is it that they ſupport their uſurpations by violating every principle of the conſtitution, trying us *twice* for the ſame offence, and depriving us of tryal "by our country and our peers?"‡ Whence it that they think our induſtry can thrive under *every reſtraint*, and that they not only load us with penſions to their hirelings, but hand us over to the plunder of their needy Lords, and deſpicable adventurers?—When all theſe queſtions are anſwered, I will aſk another.—By what tie of *gratitude or honour*, are we bound to remain ſubject to *the people* of *England*?——

Yes, my Countrymen, we owe them all the gratitude which injuries and inſults can inſpire! They *know* our force, and their art has been exhauſted to make us appear contemptible both to others and to ourſelves.

Are we not *chronicled* in all *Engliſh* "Abſtracts of the Times," as *blunderers* and *blockheads*? Do we ever appear upon their ſtage but to divert their mightneſſes, by abſurdity, and to tickle their hot vanity

‡ For offences againſt the *Woollen Act*, 10 and 11. William III. See a commentary on this extraordinary act in the letters of *Cauſidicus*.

by

by ſelf-complacent compariſon? Have we courage? It is the courage of a brute. Senſe? It is the ſlightly half-conſidering ſenſe of a madman. Generoſity or feeling?—They are untinctured or unreſtrained by a ſingle principle of morality.

The *Gentleman*, that character which marks the man, and which is ſtamped with the uniform and univerſal currency of ages and of nations.——that character has never yet been attributed to an *Iriſhman!* Meanneſs ſubmits to the imputation. Good-humour keeps up the jeſt. Its authors, however, are half-diſpoſed to believe it (they have too much reaſon in our poverty of ſpirit!) and the *etiquette* of the ſtage and of jocularity is as *eſtabliſhed* and as abſolute as the Court of a VICEROY. Thoſe who have not dignity at home muſt expect contempt abroad. —Ye, who have travelled, ſay, which of you had the courage to announce yourſelves as *Iriſhmen*.

But, we need not be ſurpriſed at the inſults received by thoſe whoſe paſſiveneſs ſeems to court them. Other nations meet the ſame fate from Engliſh *juſtice* and *generoſity*. They allow not gallantly to a foe; and for *rival* they have ſcarce in their language another name than that of *natural enemy*. Let us appeal to the ſame brief chronicle—the ſtage of each country. We ſhall there ſee, that if the French ſometimes throw into an Engliſh character a few oddities and excentricities, if they make him extravagant, or *ſurly*, in his love of liberty and contempt of authority, they ſtill give him the ſuperior qualities that command the admiration of the underſtanding and the enthuſiaſm of the heart. The Engliſh never introduce a Frenchman, but to flatter the ſpleen of their pride, to entertain their galleries, or to heighten the brutal prejudices of their mob. They ornament his mind with every thing that is ludicrous in vainty, mean in cowardice, and truckling in avarice, and on his perſon and dreſs they exhauſt *caricature*.—The French give the Engliſh all the firmneſs, ſpirit, and dignity of the man. The Engliſh confer

confer upon the French all the meanneſs, miſchief, and mimickry of the *monkey*.

If then, my countrymen, we have the feelings of men, and will not be inſulted as ſlaves, if we aim at having a rank, a character, a *name* in the world, let us re-aſſume them in the face of the world! *Who* are they that ſhall oppoſe us?—Is it our ſovereign? It cannot be! He knows his intereſt; he remembers that we are LOYAL; he remembers that WE ALSO ARE HIS PEOPLE.—Is it the People or the Parliament of England? They dare not.—The prophecies of thoſe generous individuals, who cried out againſt the exceſſes of the nation, will at length have gained ſome credit by their completion. If they ſhould not——but I cannot make a ſuppoſition that would be abſurd and unnatural!

Shall we ſacrifice our own great intereſts, the great intereſts of poſterity, the firſt born, the gifted, of every age, of every art, of every ſcience, at the altar of that idol England? Shall we aim at an unmerited, an unprofitable, a ruinous generoſity, or ſhall we, by taking care of OURSELVES at preſent, make it POSSIBLE for us one day to be generous to *others*.—even to her who never was juſt to us? Shall we continue the ſlaves of a ſinking nation, and, as ſuch, infected to the very heart with her vices, but incapable of her virtues, —or ſhall we, by one noble effort, throw off the dead weight upon our virtue and happineſs; and encourage every ſeed of greatneſs, which ſo long has lain unvegitating under a load of fertility, or which every wind has wafted to the ſoil of our oppreſſors? Could we, by joining England in her ſtruggle with misfortune, prolong her hour of liberty and virtue, the world might gain by a friendſhip which no nation ever yet has exhibited, and *we* ſhould be *juſtified*. But her fullneſs of time is come. We cannot prevent *her* ſinking. Shall we allow her to graſp *us* in her dying convulſion, and pull us with her to the bottom?

[illegible] will they leave the [illegible] *ſelf of ſovereign!* Their [illegible] and their prudence will en- [illegible] will not leave the PEOPLE to con- [illegible] themſelves [illegible] ſpect, of being [illegible] which they wanted ſpirit to [illegible]

[illegible] murdered the father and hap- [illegible] took him into his care, [illegible] ſimplicity, or in [illegible] the lands and re- [illegible] was the ſtanding [illegible] Edwards, armed [illegible] if he allowed [illegible]